

the test laid down in the said pharmacopœia, official at the time of investigation, in that the article yielded more than 2.63 grams of the alkaloids of nux vomica per 100 mls, whereas said pharmacopœia provided that fluidextract nux vomica should yield not more than 2.63 grams of the alkaloids of nux vomica per 100 mls, and the standard of strength, quality, and purity of the article was not declared on the container thereof.

Misbranding of the said caffeine citrated tablets was alleged for the reason that the statement, to wit, "Tablet Triturates Caffeine Citrated Each tablet contains: 1 grain," borne on the label attached to the bottle containing the article, was false and misleading, in that the said statement represented that each of the tablets contained 1 grain of caffeine citrated, whereas each of said tablets did not contain 1 grain of caffeine citrated but did contain a less amount. Misbranding of the fluidextract nux vomica was alleged for the reason that the statement, to wit, "Nux Vomica U S P IX \* \* \* Standard: 2.37 Gm. to 2.63 Gm. alkaloids per 100 mls," borne on the label attached to the bottles containing the article, was false and misleading, in that the said statement represented that the article was fluidextract of nux vomica which conformed to the standard laid down in the United States Pharmacopœia, Volume IX, to wit, that it contained from 2.37 grams to 2.63 grams of the alkaloids of nux vomica per 100 mls, whereas it was not fluidextract of nux vomica which conformed to the standard laid down in the said pharmacopœia, in that it contained more than 2.63 grams of the alkaloids of nux vomica per 100 mls.

On March 23, 1926, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$1,000.

C. F. MARVIN, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**14155. Adulteration and misbranding of meat and bone scrap and meat meal. U. S. v. Mutual Rendering Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$200.**  
(F. & D. No. 19700. I. S. Nos. 14114-v, 22299-v.)

On February 18, 1926, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against the Mutual Rendering Co., a corporation, trading at Philadelphia, Pa., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the food and drugs act, on or about February 13, 1925, from the State of Pennsylvania into the State of Virginia, of a quantity of meat meal, and on or about March 18, 1925, from the State of Pennsylvania into the State of New Jersey, of a quantity of meat and bone scrap both of which products were adulterated and misbranded. The articles were labeled in part, respectively: "50% Mureco Meat & Bone Guaranteed Analysis Protein Min. 50% \* \* \* Manufactured By Mutual Rendering Co. Philadelphia, Pa." and "55% Mureco Meat Meal Guaranteed Analysis Protein Min. 55% \* \* \* Manufactured By Mutual Rendering Co. Philadelphia, Pa."

Analysis by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department of a sample from the shipment labeled "Protein Min. 50%" contained 42.8 per cent of protein and a sample from the shipment labeled "Protein Min. 55%" contained 50.1 per cent of protein.

Adulteration of the articles was alleged in substance in the information for the reason that meat and bone scraps containing less than 50 per cent of protein had been substituted for meat and bone scraps containing 50 per cent of protein, and in that meat meal containing less than 55 per cent of protein had been substituted for meat meal containing 55 per cent of protein, which the respective articles purported to be.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statements, to wit, "Guaranteed Analysis Protein Min. 50%," borne on the sacks containing the meat and bone scraps, and the statements, to wit, "Guaranteed Analysis Protein Min. 55%," borne on the sacks containing the meat meal, were false and misleading, in that the said statements represented that the articles contained 50 per cent of protein, or 55 per cent of protein, as the case might be, and for the further reason that they were labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that they contained 50 per cent of protein or 55 per cent of protein, as the case might be, whereas the said articles did not contain the amount of protein declared on the labels but did contain in certain of the sacks a less amount.

On March 12, 1926, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$200.

C. F. MARVIN, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*